

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 1-30 were rejected. By this Response, claims 1, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended. In addition, claims 10, 16, 29, and 30 have been cancelled and new claims 31-33 have been added. New claims 31-33 add no new matter and are fully supported in the specification. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-28, and 31-33 will be pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the limitation “the enclosure” in claim 11 did not have any antecedent basis. Claim 11 has been amended to provide the antecedent basis for “the enclosure” recitation. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Madsen et al. (hereinafter “Madsen”). As noted above, claims 10, 16, 29, and 30 have been canceled by this response and claims 1, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 25, and 26 have been amended.

Claims 1-9, 11-15, and 17-28 are not anticipated because the cited reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). For a prior art reference to anticipate under section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir.

1990). In order to maintain a proper rejection under section 102, a single reference must teach each and every element or step of the rejected claim, else the reference falls under section 103. *Atlas Powder v. E.I. du Pont*, 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

**Independent Claim 1**

Amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Madsen because the cited reference does not disclose “a dongle having...a USB connector for selective mating engagement with the USB port, wherein the weight of the dongle is supported entirely by the mating engagement of the USB connector to the USB port.” The Madsen reference discloses an adapter module 50 and a PCMCIA card 52 that are inserted into adjacent PCMCIA slots of a portable computer. *See* Madsen, column 8, lines 8-11. However, the weight of the adapter module 50 is not “supported entirely by the mating engagement of the USB connector to the USB port,” as recited in claim 1.

In Madsen, receiving members 102 and 104 within the PCMCIA slots hold the adapter module 50 and the PCMCIA card 52 to a portable computer. *See* Madsen, column 8, lines 8-11 and column 9, lines 1-9. The adapter module 50 has rails 98 and 100 that extend outwardly along the right side 94 and the left side 96, respectively, of an extension 84 of the adapter module 50. *See* Madsen, column 8, lines 66-67. The PCMCIA card 52 has similar rails 66 and 68. *See* Madsen, column 9, lines 1-3. The receiving members 102 and 104 are configured to receive the outwardly extending rails 98 and 100 of the adapter module 50 and rails 66 and 68 of the PCMCIA card 52. *See* Madsen, column 8, lines 66-67. The rails 66 and 68 of the PCMCIA card 52 and the rails 98 and 100 of the extension 84 are configured to securely hold the PCMCIA card 52 and the adaptor module 50 in the receiving members 102 and 104 of the adjacent PCMCIA slots. *See* Madsen, column 9, lines 1-3. (Emphasis added). Thus, the Madsen reference does not disclose a dongle whose weight is supported entirely by mating engagement between a USB connector and a USB port. Therefore, the Madsen reference does not

disclose all of the recited features of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the Madsen reference.

**Independent Claims 12 and 19**

Amended independent claims 12 and 19 also are not anticipated by the Madsen reference. As with claim 1, the Madsen reference does not disclose all of the recited features of claims 12 and 19. For example, the Madsen reference does not disclose “a dongle having a universal serial bus (USB) connector...wherein the dongle is configured to enable the USB connector to be connected to a recessed USB port of a computer,” as recited in amended independent claim 12. Similarly, the Madsen reference does not disclose: “inserting a universal serial bus (USB) connector of a first communication dongle...into a recessed USB port of a computer,” as recited in amended independent claim 19.

The adaptor module 50 of Madsen reference has an auxiliary connector 118 that has a first extension 120 that is configured to be connected to an interface 112 of the PCMCIA card 52. *See* Madsen, column 10, lines 18-20. In addition, the Madsen reference discloses that the interface 112 could be a universal serial bus (USB). *See* Madsen, column 9, lines 28-30. However, the interface 112 is not a recessed USB port of a computer. *See* Madsen, Fig. 7. First, the interface 112 is simply not recessed into the PCMCIA card 52. Furthermore, the PCMCIA card 52 is not a computer. Therefore, the interface 112 of the PCMCIA card 52 is not “a recessed USB port of a computer,” as recited in claims 12 and 19.

Furthermore, the adaptor module 50 does not enable the USB connector to be connected to a recessed USB port of a computer. The adapter module 50 has an extension 84 that extends well beyond the first extension 120 of the auxiliary connector 118 of the adaptor module 50. Thus, the extension 84 of the adaptor module 50 would block the first extension 120 of the auxiliary connector 118 from being connected to a

recessed USB port. *See* Madsen, Fig. 7. Thus, the adapter module 50 of Madsen is not “configured to enable the USB connector to be connected to a recessed USB port of a computer,” as recited in amended independent claim 12. Therefore, Madsen does not disclose all of the recited features of amended independent claims 12 or independent claim 19, and does not anticipate either claim 12 or claim 19.

**Independent Claim 25**

Finally, the Madsen reference also fails to disclose a computer system, comprising: “a central unit having an enclosure, the enclosure having a first universal serial bus (USB) port and a processor disposed therein” and “at least one communication dongle having...a USB connector for selective mating engagement with the first USB port,” as recited in amended independent claim 25.

As noted above, the adapter module 50 has a first extension 120 of an auxiliary connector 118 that is connected to an interface 112 of the PCMCIA card 52. As also noted above, the interface 112 may be a USB. However, the PCMCIA card 52 is not a central processing unit. Furthermore, even if the portable computer had a USB port disposed therein, the first extension 120 of the auxiliary connector 118 of the adapter module 50 would not be able to matingly engage the USB port because the extension 84 portion of the adaptor module 50 would prevent the first extension 120 from reaching the USB port, as discussed in detail above. Therefore, the Madsen reference does not disclose “a central unit having an enclosure, the enclosure having a first universal serial bus (USB) port and a processor disposed therein,” as recited in amended independent claim 25. Accordingly, Madsen does not anticipate amended independent claim 25.

**New Independent Claim 31**

The Madsen reference also fails to disclose “a printer having a universal serial bus (USB) port” or “a dongle operable to enable the printer to communicate wirelessly with a second device, the dongle comprising: a USB connector for connecting the dongle to the USB port of the printer,” as recited in new independent claim 31.

As discussed above, the Madsen reference discloses an adapter module 50 and PCMCIA card 52 for connection to PCMCIA slots of a notebook computer. However, printers do not have PCMCIA slots. Therefore, the adapter module 50 and PCMCIA card 52 simply could not be used with a printer. Thus, Madsen does not disclose all of the recited features of new independent claim 31. Accordingly, Madsen does not anticipate new independent claim 31.

For all of these reasons, amended independent claims 1, 12, 19, 25, and 31 are not anticipated by the Madsen reference. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 12, 19, 25, and 31 are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 2-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20-28, 32 and 33, which depend from independent claims 1, 12, 19, 25, and 31 respectively, also are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph A. Graham  
Reg. No. 47,607  
(281) 970-4545

Date: June 14, 2004

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS**  
**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400